

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/620,495	07/20/2000	Michael Kenneth Brown.	19-26	3563

7590 05/07/2007

Joseph B. Ryan
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER	
OSMAN, RAMY M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09620495	7/20/00	BROWN ET AL.	19-26

Joseph B. Ryan
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER
Ramy M. Osman

ART UNIT	PAPER
2157	8

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

This communication is in response to Reply Brief filed on February 14, 2007:

The reply brief filed on 2/14/2007 has been considered and placed in the file. Applicants arguments are deemed to be not persuasive, and that the claims contain broad language that enable the cited rejection. Examiner will respond only to "Point 1":

In Appeal Brief filed 9/5/2006 applicant argued that McCauley does not teach "a pattern matching process to recognize designated component structure subject to alteration in accordance with one or more augmentation files". Examiner responded accordingly in Examiners Answer dated 12/14/2006.

In the Reply Brief, in "Point 1", Applicant is arguing that McCauley does not teach "wherein the pattern matching process comprises comparing a given one of the component structures of the retrieved web content to predetermined component structures represented by respective tokens in the one or more augmentation files". Particularly applicant states that McCauley does not show that "the pattern matching process is between component structures of the retrieved web content and component structures of the augmentation file".

In reply, McCauley does indeed teach this limitation of pattern matching. Firstly, The "component structure of the retrieved web content" is equivalent to the HTML tables that are part of the information page (McCauley, column 8 lines 8-12); where the information page of McCauley is interpreted as being the "retrieved web content", and where the HTML table of McCauley is interpreted as being the "component structure" of the information page. Secondly, the "component structure of the augmentation file" is equivalent to the pane renderers that are associated with page renderers (McCauley, column 8 lines 12-17); where the page renderer of McCauley is interpreted as the augmentation file, and where the pane renderer is interpreted as the component structure of the page renderer. Thirdly, the pattern matching occurs when the page renderer determines that a particular pane renderer matches the HTML tables, and then that pane renderer is selected (McCauley, column 8 lines 6-20).

No further action by the Examiner is necessary, and the case has been forwarded to the Board of Appeals and Interferences.

ARD ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100